

## REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 2 and 8 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1-2, 4, 7, 9, 18 and 19 have been amended. Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 18 can be found at least in original claims 2 and 3, respectively. Claims 1, 3-7 and 9-19 are pending.

### ***Allowable subject matter***

Applicant appreciates the indication that claims 2-3, 10-12 and 17 contain allowable subject matter. Independent claim 1 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 2 and to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Independent claim 18 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 3. Thus, independent claims 1 and 18 are believed to be in allowable form. Claims 3-7 depend from claim 1 and are likewise believed to be allowable.

### ***Title***

The title has been amended as suggested in the Office Action.

### ***Abstract***

The abstract has been amended as suggested in the Office Action, thus overcoming the objection thereto.

### ***Drawings***

The drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). Specifically, the Office Action stated “each of the reflection surfaces being divided into a plurality of reflection surfaces (as recited in Claim 7) must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s).” Applicant believes that the Office Action intended claim 8, not claim 7, since claim 7 does not refer to a plurality of reflection surfaces, but claim 8 does. This objection is moot in light of the cancellation of claim 8.

***Specification***

The specification was objected to for informalities. The specification has been amended as suggested in the Office Action, thus overcoming the objection thereto.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph***

Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. The claims have been amended to address the issues raised in the Office Action, and applicant submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph has been overcome.

***Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102***

Claims 1, 5-7, 9, 13-14 and 18-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,234,646 to Ito et al. ("Ito"). This rejection is moot with respect to claims 1, 5-7 and 18 in light of the amendment to independent claims 1 and 18 to include subject matter from original claims 2 and 3, respectively, indicated as allowable (claims 5-7 depend from claim 1). With respect to claims 9, 13-14 and 19, applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 9 recites "a plurality of mirror finished surfaces that are arranged so as not to reflect the light emitted by the light emitting diode but to reflect an outside light incident from the lamp lens." Ito fails to disclose at least this feature of claim 9.

The Office Action equates the reflecting portions 3b of Ito with the mirror finished surfaces as recited in claim 9. In contrast to claim 9, however, Ito does not disclose that the reflecting portions 3b are arranged to reflect an outside light incident from the outer lens 5. Ito merely discloses that each of the reflecting portions 3b is for reflecting a light beam from a corresponding LED lamp 2(b) (See col. 3, lines 41-53). Nowhere does Ito disclose that the reflecting portions 3b are arranged to reflect any outside light incident from the outer lens 5. Ito fails to anticipate independent claim 9 for at least this reason.

Independent claim 19 recites “a plurality of mirror finished surfaces arranged so as not to reflect the light emitted by the light emitting diode but to reflect a light incident from outside the lamp lens”, and is thus patentable over Ito for reasons analogous to claim 9.

The dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as their respective independent claims, as well as for further patentable features recited therein. For example, applicant notes with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 10-12 and 17.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date June 16, 2016

By Thomas Bilodeau

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22428  
Telephone: (202) 945-6162  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Pavan K. Agarwal  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 40,888

Thomas G. Bilodeau  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 43,438